

# The Christian News-Letter

Edited by  
KATHLEEN  
BLISS

23rd June, 1948<sup>o</sup>

THE RESULT of the South African election has attracted attention far beyond South Africa, in Asia as well as in the West. Dr. Malan made the race question the primary issue of the election. That this was good electioneering tactics, the results show well enough.

But looked at in a world perspective the staging of an election mainly on the issue of race takes on a grim aspect. Alert members of the negro race in other parts of Africa, in America and in the West Indies are on their toes, watching to see what will be done in South Africa and how white governments elsewhere will react. Responsible Indian journals comment not only on Dr. Malan's intention to send packing from South Africa as many Indians as possible and to make life harder for those who remain, but also on the wider implications of the Nationalist victory. They speak of a "grave blow to progress" in the coming to power of men "many of whom have openly expressed their contempt for all skins of a different shade from their own" and see in the victory "foreboding of wide repercussions in the Commonwealth generally, and in India in particular".

## DR. MALAN'S RACE POLICY

Dr. Malan's election manifesto, which was embodied in a speech made in Cape Province on April 20th, makes a direct

### NEWS-LETTER

RACE POLICIES AND  
THE CHURCH

### SUPPLEMENT

THE BIBLE IN THE  
CHURCH

BY  
G. ERNEST WRIGHT

appeal to fear. One great question, he said, overshadowed all others, that is "Will the European race in the future be able, but also want to, maintain its rule, its purity and its civilization, or will it float along until it vanishes for ever, without honour, in the black sea of South Africa's non-European population?" Race friction, he said, was increasing, and was being fomented by "foreign influences" and communist agitation, which were pressing for the removal of colour bars. "This," he continued, "can mean nothing less than that the white race will lose its ruling position and that, sooner or later, South Africa will have to take its place among the half-caste nations of the world." This is an appeal to fear, the fear of a white minority of two and a half million people, who have established their own government, culture, religion, and national home in a land which includes under their rule an African population alien in culture and religion, numbering eight million.

It might be assumed from this statement that the white race in South Africa was on the brink of losing its power. The fear he plays upon is not of what is, but of what might be. His policy has been described as "reactionary", but that against which it might be supposed to be reacting could scarcely be called "progressive". As things are no native African may stand for election to either House of Parliament. The Lower House contains three European members elected by such Africans as have a property qualification (but no native in Transvaal or Orange Free State has any vote). In the Upper House there are four European members elected by Africans by indirect vote. Yet Africans are taxed and, in proportion to their means, taxed heavily. Africans and Europeans are not equal before the law either in the laws which apply to them or in the punishment of crimes. Strikes by African labour in industry are illegal, nor are any Trade Unions formed by Africans recognized by Government. Of the four provincial councils (which deal with such matters as primary education and hospital services), only one, Cape Province, admits representatives of Africans, and they are Europeans.

The chief points where this situation could be called "progressive" were perhaps the vigour and judgment of some of the European representatives of African interests in the Lower House, and the policy of the Department of Native Affairs, where efficient administration and improvements in medical and educational provisions were being earnestly sought, though they were hamstrung by the inability of Africans and the reluctance of Europeans to produce the necessary taxation.

Dr. Malan's policy he calls *Apartheid*, complete separation. "The native reserves," he says, "must be maintained and made suitable for carrying a larger population. . . . In urban areas inside the European area natives must be domiciled in their own residential areas. Only natives who have been assured of work will be admitted. . . . In view of the possession of their own national home in the reserves, natives in the European areas can make no claim to political rights. The present representation of natives in Parliament and in the Cape Provincial Council must therefore be abolished. . . . Their education in European institutions must end."

In the abstract *segregation* might be a possible solution of this, the most difficult racial problem in the world. If there were quantities of good land and a just division of it, this might be a possible way out. But the factual situation (and the one about which Christians should concern themselves, rather than with the abstract meaning of segregation) is that South Africa is not a rich land, that much of the soil is poor and needs hard work to make it fruitful. The native reserves occupy a tiny proportion of the total area.<sup>1</sup> A fact-finding Commission has found the reserves inadequate to African needs, but far from promising to enlarge them Dr. Malan has specifically undertaken not to do so except in most exceptional circumstances. The other hard fact is that South African industry could scarcely survive without African labour, and the Nationalists can scarcely intend following the logic of their own principle to the point of disrupting industry. What is called segrega-

<sup>1</sup> Approximately 11 per cent.



tion amounts to nothing more than repression. None of Dr. Malan's phrases about the "rights of non-Europeans to their own development" can hide the fact that what he means by *Apartheid* is not a just division of the land between two autonomous and equal races: he means what his Boer forefathers meant when they saw in the black races the descendents of Ham, foreordained by God to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for all time. The way in which he expresses it is that Africans may develop their own life, "but everything in their own sphere and under the sovereignty and leadership of Europeans." Cecil Rhodes, on the other hand, said from the beginning that civil and political rights in Africa should be accorded to "every civilized man". "Civilized" is a question-begging epithet, but, for all that, one which allows the fundamental point that colour of skin is not the source of rights, liberties and duties. There is an irreconcilable conflict of principle between these two statements and men must believe either the one or the other.

#### DOMESTIC POLICY OR WORLD ISSUE?

There have been sharp criticisms of South African race policy in the United Nations: they were hotly resented, partly because the race situation in South Africa has no exact counterpart elsewhere in the world and critics outside are unlikely to be good judges, and partly because there are very few nations whose spokesmen can make remarks on race questions without laying themselves open to charges of hypocrisy. Dr. Malan on behalf of his party said as soon as he took office, "In regard to our membership of the United Nations Organization, we wish to make it very clear that we, together with our predecessors in Government, accepted it on the unequivocal understanding that there was to be neither external interference in our domestic affairs nor any tampering with our autonomous rights".<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, no power on earth can stop Indians from burning with indignation at any action taken against Indians in South Africa or deter the Indian Government from voicing

<sup>1</sup> In a radio address to the South African public on June 4th.

that indignation. Nor can Dr. Malan's solemn warnings prevent Africans throughout the world from feeling that they are concerned with what happens to Africans in South Africa. Nor can those white governments and peoples which, like our own, believe in an orderly integration of black and white, doubt but that the adoption by another white government of a policy of reaction will have repercussions on race relations in other parts of Africa. The plain fact is that the revolt against white supremacy is world wide, and furthermore, there lies to hand, in Communism, a political faith which makes no distinction of colour in its summons to all exploited peoples to unite in throwing off their chains, and respects no national boundaries as barriers to its world mission.

But there is another and a deeper sense in which Dr. Malan, while he insists on the unqualified right of his Government to pursue its race policy in its own territory, has also called in the outside world. His broadcast closed with the following words :

“ Upon the assumption of our great task, we also wish to acknowledge our utter dependence on the guidance and blessing of the Almighty. In the South African constitution, the sovereignty of God in the destiny of our country is specially acknowledged and, in exercising our governmental functions, we wish to act in conformity with that confession. We acknowledge the fundamental value of the Christian faith and the indispensability of the Church with its purifying and constructive influence in our national life. It is the desire of the Government to seek the co-operation of the Church in all its branches on a common ground of faith at this important point of time especially, but also for the future. We therefore gladly invite the interest of the Church and its intercessory prayers.”

Dr. Malan is a doctor of theology of the University of Utrecht and was, until he became a journalist, a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church. Most of his utterances are coloured with Christian language, and there is no reason to

suppose that the words we have quoted are regarded by him as a few neat pious platitudes designed to bring an important broadcast to a seemly close. Let us suppose that he means what he says : then he has invoked the name of a God who is God of all men of all colours, who answers the call of men with guidance and blessing and also with judgment.

He has invoked also the Church of South Africa, but is it possible to do this without, in the very act, also calling on that Church of Christ which is without boundaries of race or nation, the Church which is throughout all the world? Some Christians will interpret such an understanding of the oneness of the Church as *carte blanche* for Christians elsewhere to denounce the race policies of Dr. Malan, as some have in the past denounced those of other South African governments, or to admonish the Churches in South Africa on their duty in matters of race.<sup>1</sup> The effect of such criticism without genuine knowledge is often to weaken, rather than strengthen, the hands of those working to turn the policy of their country away from reaction.

It is a Christian truth that wherever there is a local church, there the whole body of Christ is involved, but the New Testament speaks of this involvement as the co-inherence of members in one body, of which the chief marks are penitence for sin, the suffering of each member for all, and the dependence of all on the Grace flowing from the Head. Only when these conditions are fulfilled does criticism become possible or relevant. But the autonomous Churches of the modern world are so divided by space and distance, tradition and history, that (with the notable exception of the modern missionary movement) the conception of the involvement of each Church with all is removed to the

<sup>1</sup> These Churches do in fact differ in race policy, but few statements could be more outspoken than the following, from the preamble to a reply to a Government Commission of enquiry, mainly on native labour, by the Christian Council of South Africa: "In the opinion of this Council race should not be a determining factor in the admission to the rights of citizenship. And to this end discriminatory legislation should be progressively repealed. . . . Stress should be laid on the dangerous nature of sub-Christian phraseology such as that which speaks of preserving South Africa as a 'white man's country'."



realms of idea and of spiritual truth, to be believed in and sung about as a spiritual reality, but without bodily form. But now in this year 1948 a new factor comes into the situation, the results of which we are entirely unable to foresee. At Amsterdam in August one hundred and thirty-six Churches of the world will come together and constitute the World Council of Churches. The involvement of each Church with others then takes on a visible form which it has not had for centuries past. The process of learning in practice what this involvement means will be long, and without doubt it will be difficult, and the issue of race and colour is likely to provide some of the greatest tensions. Not to foresee this is to ask for failure.

### THE SUPPLEMENT

Professor G. Ernest Wright is Professor of Old Testament History and Theology in the McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago. He is a distinguished archaeologist, the writer of a number of books on excavations in Palestine and the editor of *The Biblical Archaeologist*, a quarterly journal published by the American Schools of Oriental Research. But Professor Wright combines with his scholarly interests a lively participation in the affairs of the Church, and a particular interest in the use of the Bible in preaching. The decay of the habit of Bible reading among Christians has frequently called for comment, and Professor Wright in his Supplement lays bare some of the reasons for this decay, and within the limits of his restricted space in a News-Letter Supplement begins to show where the remedy lies. We are making plans to pursue further this vitally important topic of the Bible in the contemporary world.

Kathleen Bliss

# THE BIBLE IN THE CHURCH

By G. ERNEST WRIGHT

IN 1943 Pope Pius XII issued the remarkable encyclical on the promotion of Biblical studies. *Divino Afflante Spiritu*. All Church authorities are asked to further the work of every branch of Biblical scholarship. All Seminaries are told to teach the Scriptures in such a way that students for the priesthood may learn to love them and to have verified in their own lives the words of the disciples on the way to Emmaus, "when, hearing the words of the Master, they exclaimed: 'Was not our heart burning within us, whilst he opened to us the Scriptures'". Every effort should be expended to get Bibles into the homes of the Catholic faithful and to encourage people to read them, because in the pages of Scripture "is to be sought that food, by which the spiritual life is nourished unto perfection".

I am not sure that this encyclical has received the attention in non-Roman Catholic circles that it deserves. Quite apart from its intrinsic merits, it vividly illustrates the "back to the Bible" movement in the Roman Church. In such disparate countries as Spain and the U.S.A. the energy and enthusiasm poured into the new Biblical societies, the growing excellence of scholarly treatises, the new translations of the Bible, the new freedom to get behind the Vulgate for a valid text, the care being shown for correct interpretation in order to avoid the old extremes of allegory, the intense interest demonstrated in history, archaeology, and allied sciences—all witness to the new day which is beginning to dawn in Roman Catholic Biblical scholarship. Incidentally, one of the recent appointments to the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome received his post-graduate training from a leading *Protestant* scholar in America.

What is to be our attitude toward this movement? The first impulse is one of gratification, not only that this fresh interest in the Bible exists, but that the Roman Church has been influenced so greatly by Protestantism! This is an important and



interesting observation, but for those of us who are members of non-Roman Churches it should not be the dominant consideration. The open Bible, the greatest weapon of the Reformation, has lost much of its power among us. The Roman Church is now becoming the champion of the open Bible, precisely because it no longer need fear the Bible in our hands. To be sure, we still honour the Scriptures, but our ignorance of them is profound and we are somewhat uncertain as to how much of them we can or should take seriously. There is a vast difference between the deference shown to the Bible as the great monument of our heritage and the daily use of it in humble, searching expectancy for light and life.

### THE MISUSE OF THE BIBLE IN PREACHING

Numerous books and articles are being written in non-Roman circles which adequately confess our surprising weakness and uncertainty in the presence of Scripture ; and the point need not be laboured here. Yet in America, at least, one cannot help but observe that the most striking proof of a lack of real respect for the Bible is the way it is so often used in preaching. I speak here not as excluding myself from the company of preachers when I say that in using the Bible we have so little honour, conscience, and common morality. We tell our people that it is God's Word, and then we treat it with less respect than we do the words of the morning newspaper. When we quote from the latter, we at least try to quote and interpret correctly ; but where the Bible is concerned, almost anything seems permissible. Any word or phrase can be taken from its context and made the spring-board for our homily. We feel no compulsion to examine carefully what precedes or follows the passage, nor to inquire as to the actual meaning of the words in their context or in the light of Biblical faith as a whole. To do so would be to indulge in what seems to be dry and irrelevant exegesis which could easily spoil the plans we have in mind. We do not bother very much with the commentaries because they are certain to confuse, rather than to enlighten ; and we cannot obtain many of them anyhow since they are out of print. Consequently, we simply take the words as they are—which means that we interpret them, that is we expound the Gospel, not so much by the Bible

itself as by our own uplifting and edifying thoughts. Yet since we are somewhat weak theologically, we are afraid to tackle often the great affirmations of Biblical faith. We find it simpler to bring them in by way of allusion and general statement while we are talking about something else. The "something else" is usually moralism or "spiritual experience". It is small wonder, therefore, that the Bible does not teach us anything, or that our people fail to hear the Word of God. We do not hear it ourselves.

Now the blame for this situation is usually laid at the door of higher criticism. The enlightened clergyman of to-day with his critical training feels that he cannot use the Bible freely without hedging. A gulf is said to exist, therefore, between him and the loyal church member who continues to read the Bible for devotional purpose but who cannot help but understand that its authority somehow has been impaired. It is a simple matter to belabour the Biblical critics, for it is all too obvious to-day that the type of Biblical criticism which became dominant during the second half of the nineteenth century is woefully inadequate as an interpretation either of Biblical faith or of Biblical institutions.<sup>1</sup> Yet the fault lies not so much with the tool, as with the presuppositions which govern its use. In other words, the basic issue is a *theological* one. It is theological uncertainty which has bred the current uncertainty and illiteracy in Biblical matters. To be sure, criticism has shown that the Bible has no verbally inerrant text. Furthermore, to many of us criticism has indicated that, contrary to Roman Catholic (cf. the encyclical above mentioned) and fundamentalist suppositions, not even the original text, if we had it, would have been completely inerrant in all matters of detail. Yet this fact becomes a real problem to faith only when we forsake the Biblical *perspective* and attempt by speculative means to erect standards of authority quite apart from a knowledge of the Biblical God. The Reformers, Calvin and Luther, certainly believed in no verbally inerrant text; yet the matter was no great problem to them. And it should not be to us if we are willing to stand on truly Biblical ground.

<sup>1</sup> For one of the most incisive analyses of this question, see T. W. Manson, "The Failure of Liberalism to Interpret the Bible as the Word of God," in Dugmore, ed., *The Interpretation of the Bible* (London, 1944), pp. 92-107.

## THE TRUE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE

We might as well frankly admit that the Bible has always been a problem and a source of embarrassment to the Church ; but the real reason is not the errors in detail we can find within it. The cause of the dilemma is instead the very nature of the Book and of the God it portrays. Throughout her history the Church has had difficulty with this matter because the Bible is so utterly different from any other sacred literature and holy writing. For a literature which is the " Word of God ", it is exceedingly strange. We should expect it to be a profound and systematic treatise concerning the major questions of theology, and every bit as difficult to understand as the writings of our great philosophers and theologians. Its very simplicity and seeming naïveté are as troublesome to us as they were to the sophisticated intelligentsia of the second century. It is primarily a *story*, one in which the Infinite is at work in the finite, and unhesitatingly described in human (anthropomorphic) terms. In it religion, history, geography, law, poetry, sermons are inextricably mixed, that one cannot help but wonder whether the good has not been so completely compromised by the flux of history that its value is largely lost. Perhaps, with Lin Yutang, we should strive for an expurgated edition of the Bible, in which the gilt frame of history, mythology, and supernaturalism is taken out, to the end that we may enjoy without encumbrance the pure beauty of what remains.<sup>1</sup> Yet to do so is to destroy the very nature of the Bible, and honesty ought to make us say so frankly. The true significance of none of mankind's great religions is to be found in ethical teachings alone, but in the theological framework, in the organic unity of the faith, and in the historical development among sinful men, which give them meaning and relevance.

The comprehension of the Bible demands in the first instance that we take seriously the Biblical God who is Lord of both nature and history, who revealed himself to his chosen servants, who through them called a people into being and in the fullness of time the Church, and who for his own name's sake directs the course of our history toward a promised goal. Yet that comprehension also demands a knowledge of history, dates, geography, text, and literary relationships, through which God has chosen

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Runes, *The Bible for the Liberal*, New York, 1946, with Lin Yutang's Foreword.



to make himself known. God has revealed himself, but his Word is made known through the "flesh". Such is the strange paradox of the Bible as the Word of God, and the primary cause of our difficulty with it.

## THE INTERPRETATION OF THE BIBLE FOR OUR DAY

Since this is the nature of the Bible, the problem of its devotional and theological use in the Church will always be a crucial one. The God of *that* history must become the God of *our* history. Rarely do the Biblical writers display an interest in the universal and permanent application of what they are saying. Instead, the concentration of most of them is on the specific needs of their own segment of time and history. Consequently, the means by which the ancient, "situation-filled" Word is related to our own day must always occupy the Church's attention. Yet comparatively little has been done with this whole problem of interpretation and application<sup>1</sup> in the present generation. What was once a major concern of the Church is scarcely more than a minor and rather uninteresting subject to-day—further witness to the deterioration of Biblically centred theology. Wilhelm Vischer's reintroduction of Christological typology in the interpretation of the Old Testament seems to have found few followers,<sup>2</sup> though Hebert's qualified and more restricted adherence to a similar methodology may attract a larger number.<sup>3</sup> Even those who disapprove of the latter have thus far done little to present a more acceptable view.

<sup>1</sup> That is, with the study of hermeneutics, that branch of theology which defines the methods or laws by which the meaning of Scripture is to be ascertained.

<sup>2</sup> See his *Das Christuszeugnis des Alten Testaments* ("The Witness of Christ in the Old Testament"), Zürich, 1942-3. This is an important book which ought to be translated. In my opinion it is not nearly as bad as it has sometimes been pictured! The author takes seriously the Christian affirmation that Christ is the Lord of both Testaments; he maintains that the Old Testament tells us *what* Christ is while the New Testament affirms *who* he is. Yet one becomes rather uncomfortable with the ease with which the author finds New Testament types throughout the Old Testament. Not only the words and the writers but also the literary structure is taken to be the result of Divine inspiration. The fact that such views cannot be disproved does not make their acceptance, without serious qualification, simpler.

<sup>3</sup> See his *The Throne of David* (London, 1942), pp. 252 ff., and *The Authority of the Old Testament* (London, 1947), pp. 262 ff.

Such treatments, however, while important, are rather formal and somewhat removed from the ongoing life of the Church. Our greatest need is for a more serious attempt to bridge the gap between the historical and the contemporary, of which the projected volume of the Study Department of the World Council of Churches ("The Biblical Authority for the Church's Social and Political Message To-Day") is an example. A new series of Biblical commentaries is desperately needed which will actually attempt to *interpret*, to make the ancient words contemporary, a task infinitely more difficult than exegesis alone. Yet it is doubtful whether at the moment the combined resources of English and American scholarship could carry such a project to the desired end. This is particularly true in the field of Old Testament study. The combination of adequate linguistic and historical scholarship with theological interest, breadth, and penetration is exceedingly rare, and the Church is the poorer for lack of these gifts.

#### THE BIBLE NOT FIRST A RULE BUT AN ILLUMINATION

In the interpretative work which lies ahead it is to be hoped that we may avoid some of the errors of the past, in particular the tendency to think of the Bible primarily and solely as the "rule of faith and practice". The emphasis in our doctrinal statements upon the Bible as a rule, as a law, and as containing a system of doctrine which we must obey and believe has had very serious consequences for faith and life. Even the liberal movement, anti-authoritarian as it has claimed to be, is involved to a large extent in this error because it has continued to think of the Bible primarily as a source book for religious ideas and ethical teachings which would form the normative guide to Christianity. In this emphasis there is a subtle transfer of infallibility from God himself to the words of Scripture. God becomes something of an unmoved Mover and the Bible exists not as the living Word but as the static norm.

In other words, the use of the word "rule" in this connection is extremely misleading because it shifts attention from the primary role which the Bible must play in the Church if it is to have any authority at all. When a man approaches the Bible

believing that it is a rule or measuring stick, he is tempted to find in it what he is looking for. He has been trained in the rule and he expects to find little else than confirmation of the truth he already possesses. He is not often led with an earnest intensity and expectancy to inquire with the Biblical writer as to God's direct Word to him whose eye has been blinded by sin. He reads not so much as a listener as one who needs assistance in making a speech.

Calvin seems to have seen the issue rather clearly. In the *Institutes* (Bk. 1, chap. VI, par. I) he wrote :

"For, as persons who are old, or whose eyes are by any means become dim, if you show them the most beautiful book, though they perceive something written, but can scarcely read two words together, yet, by the assistance of spectacles, will begin to read distinctly—so the Scripture, collecting in our minds the otherwise confused notions of Deity, dispels the darkness, and gives us a clear view of the true God."

In other words, the primary function of the Bible is to serve as the spectacles which dispel confusion and bring us to a clear perspective. The Bible is not in the first instance a rule, because the rule emerges only from our apprehension of truth ; and the purpose of the Bible is to focus the illumination so that our eyes can see. It is the means by which we come to know the truth and live in it. Unless the Bible first of all illuminates our existence and shows us where we were blind, unless through the Scripture a new and brilliant light shines upon us so that we can see what we are doing but apart from which we are in darkness, it is idle to talk about a rule or a Biblical system of doctrine. In the Biblical perspective the latter emerge from the former.

This, however, is not to devaluate the importance of a doctrine or a rule. Certain modern circles to the contrary, there is more to the Bible than the Divine-human encounter. There is law and doctrine in profusion, but they arise in the encounter. In the Biblical perspective one begins with fact and event, with what is and with what is happening. The all-absorbing question is : What do these things mean ? In searching for meaning the Biblical writers turned immediately to the sovereign Lord of



both nature and history. Every event has a meaning, every situation a promise and a warning, because God determines it so. Everything which is or happens must be earnestly studied and examined, for it has an intended revelation of God. Man's encounter with the hidden God, therefore, is not primarily in some mystical experience beyond the ken of the ordinary person's life; the encounter takes place for those who with eyes of faith search for the revelation of God's will with a desperate earnestness in each of life's events.

Yet it is obvious that the correct interpretation of fact and event cannot proceed successfully without the guidance of doctrine, without a knowledge of God himself and of our own nature which is taught from generation to generation as revealed truth. The Bible's concern, however, is not to systematize a series of axioms or universals as abstractions; the latter seem to have little meaning apart from history, from the actual process of living. The concern is to exhort, to admonish, to guide, to interpret so that repentance, faith, and newness of life may be formed in the believer. Biblical doctrine is a living theology which refuses to be encased or frozen in an abstract system. It is no more static than is life itself. For the sake of convenience man has of necessity tried repeatedly to systematize it, but his efforts are partial because the Biblical God has always proved greater than human systems and by his acts in history has continually broken the systems. Thus while doctrine is essential, there is something in the Bible of more fundamental importance which never allows man to rest content with the systematizations of belief which he attempts to make. In a sense every abstract universal which he formulates must be held in tension because God is not known in the abstraction. He reveals himself in the particular events of our history.

To some such a point of view may not be sufficiently specific or authoritarian. Yet we should not delegate unto ourselves more authority than God has granted us. In any event, it seems to me that if we could recapture something of this Biblical perspective we should find the perplexing problem of faith and criticism, of loyalty to Christ and intellectual freedom, in large measure resolved. The Bible will never achieve its proper place

in the life of the Church until and unless the historical word and the living Word become one, so that in what God has spoken he now speaks. Yet this will never be until we stand in the Biblical perspective and seek a knowledge of God by giving attention to what he says both then and now. We shall never learn the issue of our lives, nor shall we understand the Bible, nor will the Bible have any power among us, so long as we insist on giving our exclusive attention to questions with which the Bible is largely unconcerned. The problems which preoccupy those engaged in technical discussion to-day, such as errancy versus inerrancy, monotheism versus monolatry, the form of the Church and the episcopacy, the "homology" of the Old and New Testaments, are interesting and important, but their discussion is not the way of *salvation* because in them the Bible does not speak the Word of God. What does it mean that the God of Israel and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, *the living Lord*, not our idea of the holy nor the prime cause, nor the Spirit of nature, encounters us on the pages of the Bible and demands a personal, inescapable, life and death decision here and now in this particular day with these particular tasks before us? This is the tremendous question with which the Church, if it would be anything but powerless and shallow, must be primarily concerned and from which it can never escape.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For fuller presentations of the point of view here expressed, see the articles of the writer and his colleague, Joseph Haroutunian, in *Interpretation, A Journal of Bible and Theology* (Richmond, Virginia), Vol. I, Nos. 2 and 3 (April and July, 1947).

---

**Subscriptions**—£1 (\$4.00 in U.S.A. and Canada) for one year, 10s. 6d. for six months (Great Britain and Ireland only). Single copies, 10d.; reduction for quantities.

**Indices**—Vols. I—XII (Oct. 1939—Dec. 1947), 1s. each post free.

**Folders**—To hold six months' supply, 3s. each post free.

**Groups**—Special rates for group subscriptions may be had on application.

**Bound Volumes**—Vols. II—XII (May 1940—Dec. 1947) 15s. each post free, or 12s. 6d. each in sets of four or more consecutive volumes.

*All communications and subscriptions should be sent to—*  
**THE CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER, 20 BALCOMBE STREET, DORSET SQUARE, LONDON, N.W. 1**

---

Published by the Christian Frontier Trust, Ltd., and printed in Great Britain by the Church Army Press, Cowley, Oxford.